United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.19

General Assembly

Official Records

Fifty-sixth session

First Committee

19th meeting

Wednesday, 31 October 2001, 10 a.m.

New York

President: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84 (*continued*)

Thematic discussion on item subjects; introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: Today the Committee will continue the third phase of its work — action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items. We will continue to take action on draft resolutions that appeared in the informal working paper 2/Rev.1, which is at your disposal. I would like to explain to you the difference between informal working paper 2 and informal working paper 2/Rev.1. There are two differences. This is just to explain why we published informal working paper 2/Rev.1. One difference is that in informal working paper 2, you had, under cluster 7, draft resolution L.29, which had been deleted in Rev.1. This is a draft resolution on the United Nations Regional Centre for peace and disarmament in Africa. You will not find this in Rev.1. The other difference between paper 2 and paper 2/Rev.1 is that we added to Rev.1 draft resolution A.C.1/56/L.41/Rev.1, and this is on the maintenance of international security, good-neighbourliness, stability and development of south-eastern Europe. This is a draft that is added to paper 2/Rev.1; it did not figure in paper No. 2. So I would like to draw your attention to informal working paper 2/Rev.1. That revised working paper is the basis for today's proceedings.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, on conventional weapons — you will see this in informal working paper 2/Rev.1 — I shall give the floor to those delegations that wish to introduce revised draft resolutions, if there are any.

I shall now call on the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce revised draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.1/Rev.1.

Mr. Antonov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation has submitted to the First Committee an updated version of the draft resolution on the preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, sponsored by Belarus, China and the Russian Federation. Fiji and Haiti have also joined as sponsors.

We wish to make it clear from outset that our document has not undergone any major changes. It incorporates one addition that corresponds to present realities. As members are aware, in accordance with the Genoa agreement between the Presidents of Russia and the United States, a dialogue is being held between our two countries on the interrelated issues of strategic offensive weapons and defence systems. That dialogue includes a discussion of a new strategic framework. We believe that the ongoing consultations will largely determine the direction of the further evolution of the strategic situation.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-61160 (E)

In view of these contacts, which are being maintained at various levels, we have introduced a corresponding amendment to the draft resolution. We have thus sought to take into account the proposals made by many delegations concerning the desirability of the draft resolution's reflecting in a positive way the dialogue between Russia and the United States on strategic stability. Specifically, we would add to the draft resolution a new operative paragraph 7 containing a reference to the ongoing dialogue between the Russian Federation and the United States on a new strategic framework.

We believe it desirable that the General Assembly express its opinion in this regard, as the dialogue in question touches on vital issues and is taking place in a changing security environment. We feel that this amendment makes the draft resolution more concrete and in tune with the latest developments. We express our hope that this addition to the draft resolution will be met with understanding by the international community and that the draft resolution will receive even greater support.

The Chairman: I wish to draw members' attention to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1, "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them". I have received a request for the postponement of action on that draft resolution today.

I ask the Committee to take due note of this request for postponement.

Mr. Ahipeaud Guebo (Côte d'Ivoire): My delegation wishes to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.1/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in working paper No. 2/Rev.1.

We will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution in cluster 4, contained in document A/C.1/56/L.34, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Lee (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

The Republic of Korea shares the humanitarian concerns of the international community regarding the suffering and tragic casualties caused by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. In this vein, we have supported and made contributions to several United Nations landmine action programmes. However, the issue of anti-personnel landmines carries not only humanitarian, but also security aspects. Anti-personnel landmines remain a legitimate minimum national defence requirement for some countries. For this reason, the Republic of Korea is presently unable to adhere to the mine-ban treaty.

We also wish to stress that the Republic of Korea uses anti-personnel landmines only in a limited area of the demilitarized zone. For this reason, anti-personnel landmines pose few safety concerns for civilians in our country, unlike the situation in other parts of the world.

At the same time, there are approaches to controlling anti-personnel landmines that can ensure the universal participation of States. My delegation shares the view that the mine-ban treaty provides a comprehensive framework for many aspects of mine action. Moreover, Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects also includes a humanitarian aspect, in that it bans the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. In our view, those two mechanisms should carry equal weight in dealing with mine problems in the current situation.

This year the Republic of Korea acceded to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II. My Government declared an indefinite extension of its moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines in 1997, and since then has implemented it faithfully. We also support negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a treaty banning the transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34 fails to address all those concerns; therefore, my delegation will abstain in the vote.

Mr. Sungar (Turkey): I would like to explain Turkey's position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34,

entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Although Turkey is not yet a party to the Ottawa Convention, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution. Turkey is fully conscious of the casualties and the human suffering caused by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of mines. We attach importance to the mine-ban treaty and consider it to be among the major achievements of the international community towards the total elimination of anti-personnel landmines.

However, the security situation around Turkey is distinctly different from that which the proponents of the Ottawa process face. That situation has prevented us from signing the treaty. On the other hand, our commitment to the treaty's goals have been manifested by our participation in the first, second and third Meetings of the States Parties, held respectively at Maputo, Geneva and Managua. In January 1996, Turkey also put into effect a national moratorium banning the sale and transfer of anti-personnel landmines; in 1998 that moratorium was extended until 2002.

I take this opportunity to stress once more my Government's determination to become a party to the Ottawa Convention. Our intention to that effect was made public as early as 6 April 2001 during the visit to Turkey of the Greek Foreign Minister, His Excellency Mr. George Papandreou. On that occasion it was announced that Turkey and Greece would concurrently start the procedures that would make both countries parties to the Ottawa Convention.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt has asked for the floor for the purpose of explaining its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34. At the outset, we want to stress that Egypt is considered to be among the countries most affected by landmines and unexploded ordnance. The continued existence of more than 22 million landmines, scattered over 288,000 acres of Egyptian territory, causes serious concern to the Government of Egypt. The overwhelming majority of those landmines date back to the Second World War.

Although the Egyptian Government supports the humanitarian objectives that inspired the conception of the Ottawa Convention, the Egyptian Government considers that the Convention fails to address some pressing concerns. Those concerns can be summarized in the following two points. First, the Convention does not provide a binding legal framework that recognizes the responsibility of countries that plant and deploy their mines on the territory of other States, and hence does not provide a commitment by those States to clear their landmines. Furthermore, the Convention does not deal adequately with, or provide assistance for, landmine clearance.

Secondly, the Convention does not take into consideration the legitimate right of States to self-defence, as stipulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, or the valid necessity to legitimize the use of anti-personnel landmines when no other financially feasible alternative exists. That matter is of the utmost centrality for States with extended and otherwise unprotected borders that are vulnerable to terrorist infiltration, smuggling of arms and explosives and drug trafficking.

As with similar texts in previous years, Egypt will again at the fifty-sixth session abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, as a sign of our commitment and of our engagement in trying to conclude a more comprehensive and complete convention that would take into consideration once and for all the concerns and circumstances of all nations as well as the breadth of the mine problem.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Since Pakistan is not a party to the Ottawa Convention, we cannot favour the draft resolution on the use of landmines, given our security requirements. Nevertheless, Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines.

My delegation will thus be obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

Mr. Kariyawasam (Sri Lanka): My delegation wishes to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling,

Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, as it has on similar texts in the past, in appreciation of the humanitarian objectives of the Convention banning anti-personnel mines. However, the Government of Sri Lanka is not yet in a position to accede to the Convention, on account of essential security considerations.

Mr. Elmehdi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation endorses the statement of the representative of Egypt on the question of landmines. We fully support the humanitarian goals of the Ottawa Convention, but Libya's position on the Convention is clear: the Convention does not refer to countries that are responsible for laying such mines on the territory of other States. On several past occasions we have referred to our reservations about the Convention. We call for the amendment of the Convention to make reference to the responsibility of warring States that lay such mines on the territory of other countries. Such States must pay compensation and must help with mine clearance.

For those reasons, we will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation has consistently voted in favour of the draft resolution that we are about to adopt on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Landmines and on Their Destruction. However, my country has not yet been able to become a party to this Convention. Although we do not want to stand in the way of the adoption of this draft resolution, I should just like to recall that it may not be convenient for my country at the moment to accede to the treaty without delay, as required by operative paragraph 1 of this draft, due to some security concerns.

Mrs. Osode (Liberia): I am sorry to bring this up at this stage of the voting process. Liberia will not participate in the voting. However, Liberia is a party to the Ottawa Convention. I had thought that Liberia had been among the sponsors of this draft resolution, but, as I do not see its name mentioned, I would request that it be included in the list of sponsors.

The Chairman: I would ask the Secretariat to take note of this request.

If no other delegations wish to take the floor at this stage of our proceedings, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nicaragua at the 14th meeting of the Committee, held on 24 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/56/L.34 and also in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Brunei Darussalam, Djibouti, Eritrea, Gabon, Guinea, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

I should also like to draw the attention of members to document A/C.1/56/L.52, which contains a note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Cameroon advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Baeidi Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran shares the sentiments of the States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Landmines and on Their Destruction, sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.34 and its submission for consideration and action by the General Assembly.

Landmines have been used irresponsibly by the military and by armed factions during civil wars in certain regions of the world and consequently have claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. This situation is not acceptable, and we welcome every effort to stop this trend.

The landmines Convention, however, is far from being a conclusive and comprehensive response to this tragedy. The real campaign to combat the irresponsible use of landmines needs to be far-reaching and should include the different and multifaceted aspects of the issue. This Convention could be more effective if the concerns of a large number of key landlocked countries with long land borders had been taken into consideration.

Due to this reality, the Convention has not been received with enthusiasm in all regions of the world. Landmines continue to be the sole effective means of ensuring minimum border security requirements in many countries with long land borders. The difficulty of monitoring sensitive long areas by established and permanent guarding posts or effective warning systems would leave no option for those countries other than resorting to landmines.

These mines, however, are used under strict, established rules and regulations to protect civilians. Facts and information can attest to the fact that no civilian casualties have been recorded as the victims of landmines laid down by the regular armed forces to protect borders against insurgencies and intrusions.

But the landmines process is an evolving one, and complementary efforts need to be pursued. More efforts are needed to explore new alternatives to landmines. In the meantime, the observance and strengthening of standards to limit the use of landmines should be encouraged.

Moreover, international efforts must also be made to speed up mine-clearance activities within the United Nations system. We are encouraged in this context by recent initiatives to increase landmine-clearance awareness as well as international cooperation in the mine-clearance field.

Of course, much remains to be done, and we hope that more tangible and practical endeavours will be undertaken to assist all States in mine clearance. My delegation, therefore, while appreciating the essence and objective of the draft resolution, could not — due to its particular concerns and considerations — support the draft resolution and therefore abstained in the voting.

Mr. Myint (Myanmar): I should like to explain my delegation's position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.34, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Myanmar is not a party to the Ottawa Convention, but we respect the positions of the countries that have signed and ratified the Convention. Myanmar is of the view that indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines is a major cause of the deaths and injuries of innocent people. The easy availability of landmines also contributes significantly to those tragedies. We should also address the issue of the illicit trafficking and indiscriminate use of landmines by non-State actors. We should also bear in mind that every State should have the right to self-defence when its national security interests are in danger.

We continue to believe that acceding to the ban on anti-personnel mines is not yet a practical and effective measure under the prevailing circumstances. For that reason, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in L.34.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation would like to set forth its position on the issue of anti-personnel landmines and the reasons which have led it to abstain on this draft resolution.

India remains committed to the objective of a non-discriminatory, universal and global ban on anti-personnel landmines through a phased process that addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States while ameliorating the particular humanitarian crises that have resulted from an indiscriminate transfer and use of landmines.

We believe that a phased approach should be commenced as a confidence-building process, enabling States, especially those with long borders, to safeguard their legitimate security needs. The process of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by addressing the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines for operational requirements, under the defence doctrines of countries concerned, through the availability of appropriate militarily-effective non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform, cost-effectively, the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines.

We would support negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a ban on transfers of anti-personnel landmines on the basis of a mandate that reflects the interests of all delegations. India has been an active participant in the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) process and has ratified all its protocols, including Amended Protocol II on landmines. Therefore, my delegation has abstained on this resolution.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My country has always given due importance and attention to the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Cuba firmly supports the ban on all indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. We stand opposed, among other things, to the use of anti-personnel mines in domestic conflicts, the use of non-detectable mines and, in general, of all mines that may adversely impact civilian populations. That is why we are a party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and were very actively involved in the drafting of its Amended Protocol II on mines, booby-traps and other devices.

However, we believe that the ultimate purpose of negotiations on anti-personnel mines has always been that of guaranteeing the greatest protection for civilians and not that of limiting the military capability of States to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the legitimate right of self-defence recognized in the Charter. The absence of recognition of the legitimate security interests of States in the draft resolution adopted is the primary reason why Cuba abstained from the vote on it. If Cuba — a country which for over 40 years has been thoroughly subjected to a policy of hostility and aggression by the country that has the greatest military, economic, and political power on Earth — were to forswear this kind of weapon for the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, it would create for us a challenge that we cannot afford. We continue to fully support all those efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian concerns and national security, aim at eliminating the terrible consequences of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines for the civilian population of many countries.

Mr. Itzhaki (Israel): Israel supports the ultimate humanitarian goal of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of

Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, aimed at eliminating the consequences of indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. Towards that end, Israel has begun taking concrete steps to reduce the proliferation and harmful effects of anti-personnel landmines. Among those are the moratorium on the export and production of anti-personnel landmines and Israel's ratification of the amended protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). Israel participates actively in the mine awareness project launched by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in Angola. We are proud to announce that earlier this year, an agreement was signed between the Government of Israel and Angola UNICEF to substantially expand this important project. Israel also increased extensively its financial support in this regard.

Israel abstained in this resolution because it is still required to resort to defensive operations against terrorists in order to prevent attacks on its civilians. Therefore, we remain at present unable to support an immediate enactment of a total ban on landmines. Israel supports a gradual regional process towards the eventual goal of a total ban on landmines, based on peaceful relations and regional cooperation.

Mr. Leck (Singapore): Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With this in mind, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium, in May 1996, on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manners of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely.

At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counter-productive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns about anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community to find a durable and truly global solution.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position following the action taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.34.

I would like to tell members that unavoidable zigzags are definitely something we have to face. I am very happy to report to members — and I am adding all this with their indulgence — that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1, according to the information given to us by its sponsor, is ready for action. So I would like to ask members to turn their attention back to cluster 4. In the interest of moving forward, I would like to give the floor to the representative of Mali to introduce that revised draft resolution.

Mr. Keita (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I would like once again to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them". This draft resolution has been the object of some revisions submitted by some African countries. That is why we are introducing document A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1.

The draft resolution takes into account the language of the Bamako Conference and the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. It is being introduced, as occurs annually, on behalf of the 16 countries of the Economic Community of West African States. It has also enjoyed, since last year, the support of the European Union. I have already introduced it to the Committee, and I hope countries will, like every year, join the consensus and that it will be adopted by consensus by the Committee.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): It is my understanding that it has already been announced that the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1 will be postponed. I believe that consultations are under way between my delegation, the delegation of Mali, other delegations and the sponsors in order to revise the draft text, in keeping with the Bamako Declaration and the Programme of Action. My understanding is that an announcement of postponement has already been made.

The Chairman: I would simply say yes, I made an announcement at the beginning, but I made another announcement saying that the sponsors are ready to take action on this.

Having said that, and also understanding the point that the representative of Egypt made, while also recalling that the sponsors have declared their draft ready for action, we shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them".

Before we take action, I shall call upon those delegations that wish to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): It was the Egyptian delegation's decision to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1. We believe that a resolution by consensus is very important in this regard. This is not the last day of the First Committee's session, and it is very important that consultations continue with the delegation of Mali and the sponsors. However, it seems that that is not the case. The delegation of Mali and the sponsors are introducing the draft resolution for action today.

We find that the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1 is far from what has been stated in the Bamako Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. I believe that the United Nations Conference, which adopted the Programme of Action in July 2001, is the cornerstone for dealing with the problem of small arms and light weapons. Hence, I believe that the international community should abide by the agreed language, and we should refrain from using other language that could hamper the follow-up process of this Conference and its Programme of Action. I believe that adopting the draft resolution sponsored by Mali as revised, with language different from that which has already been agreed, will have a negative influence on the follow-up process. Despite all these considerations, and taking into account our good relations with the delegation of Mali and with all countries of West Africa, my delegation will not ask for a deferred vote on the draft resolution. However, we do not consider ourselves part of any consensus decision that might be taken on the draft resolution today. I request that our reservations on the draft resolution be reflected in the documents of the First Committee.

Mr. Goussous (Jordan): I will be brief. In addition to what the representative of Egypt has just said about draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1, let me add that we are actually seeking consensus on this draft resolution owing to its importance for all of us. We support the idea of holding consultations, in view of the contradiction between the preambular and operative parts of the revised draft resolution, since the main issue has been the illicit trade in small arms and not their proliferation. We need to work within the same framework as that of Bamako, as well as that of the Programme of Action that was adopted in July.

But, as we mentioned earlier, we are not here to block any consensus. We are very much in favour of consensus, but we think that it is important to explain our position with regard to this detail — that is, with regard to the discrepancies between the preambular and operative parts of the draft resolution. But we are in favour of it, and we will not block any consensus.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.1/Rev.1 is a consensus resolution; it has been a consensus resolution for many years. As in previous years, we support the draft resolution introduced by Mali. However, this is not the first time that members of the First Committee call for time for short consultations among some delegations that have some concerns, concerns that have to be taken up with the sponsor of this draft resolution. I think this is the spirit that has predominated in this Committee in the past, as well as during this session under your chairmanship. We believe that such a request should be entertained — not only so that we can arrive at a consensus on a position, but also so that we can reach a consensus in our views and inner reflections in concert with the delegations that are concerned. My delegation, if this draft resolution is going to be tabled today — which it will be — will, of course, support the consensus, but we would like to note our concern that, if one or more delegations have views regarding any draft resolution and they need further consultations, we still have time, and we think this request should be entertained.

The Chairman: According to the rules of procedure, the sponsors of draft resolutions are not allowed to explain their position or to explain their vote on the draft resolution before the Committee. With this in mind, and since I do not see non-sponsors asking for the floor, I wish to proceed further. The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1.

Does South Africa wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): I seek some clarification as to whether any delegation can request a deferment of the action on a resolution. Do the rules of procedure provide for this? Because, as previous speakers have said, I wonder if the delegation of Mali wishes to consider this option?

I seek some clarification from the Secretary of the Committee.

The Chairman: As you know, distinguished colleagues, we are in the process of taking action on the draft resolution. The rules of procedure specify how we proceed: what happens before the vote, then the action that is taken and then what happens after the vote. This is the regular procedure that we have been following thus far.

At the same time, when unexpected things come up, the Committee obviously may decide if it wishes to make an exception and, in light of the present situation, decide by common accord to postpone the action on the draft resolution. If I put this question to the Committee, it means that we are, in a way, stopping the clock and each and every delegation is entitled to speak on that specific subject, including the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Since the issue was raised by the representative of South Africa whether to contemplate a possible deferment of action on this draft resolution, I ask delegations if any of you wish to address this issue; and then the Committee will have to decide if we agree with the postponement of action on A/C.1/56/L.5l/Rev.1.

I am saying — and I am adding this in brackets — that the draft resolution itself — even if we heard some difficulties expressed by various delegations — seems to be ready for adoption by consensus. So, it is not a draft resolution that would present insurmountable principal difficulties among various delegations. But, then again, since the question has been raised, I would like to ask delegations, if they so wish, to share with us their perceptions as to whether they agree — or rather whether they favour — the postponement of a decision on draft resolution L.51/Rev.1. I hope we can dispense quickly with this because we have so many other draft resolutions to deal with.

At this point in time, I am asking delegations if they wish to address this specific issue.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): My position is not to delay matters or stop any action from being taken, but I believe that my delegation previously asked for the deferment in order to allow it, and other delegations from the Arab Group, to continue consultations in this regard with the delegations of Mali and the sponsors, so as to have a draft resolution that is acceptable to all delegations, without raising any reservations on it.

We are still on the second day, which is supposed to be the first day of voting, and we still have eight or nine meetings for voting. I therefore request once again that we defer taking action on this draft resolution, in order to reach an agreement and adopt it without any reservations.

The Chairman: To be absolutely in line with the procedures — as I am looking into the rules of procedure of the General Assembly — all that is now unfolding before us is within the framework of what we call points of order. Rule 113 of the rules of procedure says:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the Chairman in accordance with the rules of procedure. A representative may appeal against the ruling of the Chairman. The appeal shall be immediately put to the vote, and the Chairman's ruling shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the members present and voting."

The Chairman makes a ruling. We will take action on A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1. Representatives have the possibility to appeal against this ruling, and then we will have to put that appeal to the vote. This is the last thing I want us to do, because we have some things to do. But again, basing myself on the rules of procedure and, most importantly, hearing the views of those who had some difficulties with L.51/Rev.1, I still feel that we can take action, because the generosity that transpires from these statements indicated that they would not stand in the way of a consensus. This is why the Chairman's ruling is that we are going to take action on L.51/Rev.1.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): Of course, my delegation will not call for the vote in this regard. We maintain good relations with the delegation of Mali, and we

want to avoid any confrontation in this regard. Unfortunately, we have reservations on the entirety of the draft resolution. It is also unfortunate that the draft resolution presented by Colombia, Japan and South Africa will be open to further consideration upon the adoption of this resolution.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Egypt for his openness. I do not even want to talk about confrontation here. I appreciate your point, and I think that people will bear this in mind when we proceed further in our consultations on various other drafts that are before this Committee.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): I apologize for taking the floor again. Given the statement just made by the representative of Egypt, in which he made a linkage with another resolution dealing with small arms, my delegation wonders whether it would not be in the best interests of this Committee to defer action on this draft resolution, A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1. We also share the view by Egypt that we are only in the second day of taking action, and perhaps the Committee should express itself on this.

The Chairman: Do I understand you that you are "appealing against the ruling of the Chairman"? This is a quote from rule 113, and the formula you use was a different one. I want to make clear before the Committee whether we actually are in the face of an appeal against the ruling, because then, according to the rules of procedure, we will have to go further and put to the vote the appeal that was just made. On a point of clarification, the representative of South Africa has the floor.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): It is not our desire simply to delay action on the draft resolution, but we note the statement made by Egypt indicating that there would be a linkage to a resolution that the sponsors have stated should be adopted without a vote. If by voting on this draft resolution we force the delegation of Egypt and others to open up consensus on another draft resolution, we would in that case appeal against the ruling of the Chairman.

The Chairman: Let me say that it is not my intention, nor is it the intention of others, to interpret statements given by any delegation. We are focusing here on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1. What delegations plan to do in the future in their different consultations is, in the eyes of the Chairman, a different matter.

Again, I think that in the light of the statements we heard on behalf of both Egypt and South Africa, we can proceed with the action on L.51/Rev.1, unless there is a formal appeal against the ruling of the Chairman, in spite of what various delegations might have said earlier. And I appeal to you and also ask for your understanding not to try to dissect various statements that are given at this point in time, not to try to interpret those statements and make them impact on what we are actually doing at this point in time in this Committee.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): I am not challenging you again in your ruling, but I think that there is a way out by requesting the delegation of Mali to allow us some more time. We could have more consultations as we come for the voting tomorrow and after tomorrow. We still have time. I am emphasizing again that we still have time, and we can reach a common understanding with regard to this resolution.

The Chairman: The fact is that there has been a ruling by the Chairman. The ruling was to proceed with the decision. If I overrule myself, I will destroy my credibility in your eyes. Based on rule 113, I declared solemnly that the Chairman rules that we will take action on this draft resolution unless a delegation formally appeals against this ruling. I also ask for your understanding that such a ruling has already been made. Even if now the delegation of Mali were to plead with me to defer action on this draft resolution, a Chairman's ruling has already been made, and by the way, I did not hear anything from the delegation of Mali. I ask you, please, to be generous in this matter, and let us not be bogged down at this point in time in procedural discussions.

Again, I recalled the statements that were made, and we all understand the difficulties that some delegations might have had. But at the end of the day, what transpired from those statements was that those delegations would not stand in the way of a consensus decision — which is great thing, and this is why I used the word "generosity" when I labelled some of those statements which would allow the Committee to proceed further on this issue. Again, I hope that in the next couple of days delegations will bear in mind the whole intermezzo that we are witnessing today so that we can avoid similar situations.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): Appealing to your ruling should not be considered to be undermining your

credibility — not at all. As a matter of fact, we appreciate the fact that you follow the rules of procedure quite closely. And you have no other choice but to do so, given the rules of procedure. But given the new facts that come to light, in view of the Egyptian statement, my delegation wishes formally to appeal in terms of the rules of procedure, and we wish to place on record that this is not an appeal against your discretion, but simply because of the provisions of the rules of procedure.

The Chairman: Let there be no mistake: When someone appeals against a ruling of the Chairman, he or she is acting precisely in accordance with rule 113. There is no problem here.

What I was alluding to was that a formal appeal has not been mentioned. There are different formulas that can be used, but in this case I take it that the representative of South Africa wishes to appeal against the ruling of the Chairman. That is quite clear and he is absolutely in order.

I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): My delegation would not want to resort to this procedural gimmick and would prefer more consultations in this regard. This is a draft resolution that has always been adopted by consensus.

I would appeal to you, Sir, to suspend the meeting for five minutes. If we can reach agreement with the delegation of Mali and the sponsors, I think we can avoid all these procedural gimmicks.

The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.55 a.m.

The Chairman: I ask for the understanding of members with respect to the length of the suspension, which proved to be longer than five minutes.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): At the outset, I should like to recall that the South African delegation had asked for clarification about the right of a delegation to request a postponement of a vote. Having done so, we ended up in a situation where the Chair had to make a ruling in terms of the rules of procedure.

My delegation considers the issue of small arms to be extremely important. For that reason, we sponsored, with the delegations of Colombia and of Japan, a draft resolution that we considered to be one of the most important before the Committee given the consensus outcome of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

We do not see that there are linkages among any of the draft resolutions before the Committee, and we do not consider it appropriate that such linkages should be made. Each draft resolution should be considered on its own merits and should be acted upon accordingly. For that reason, my delegation can go along with the Chair's ruling that we should act on the draft resolution, and we withdraw our appeal of that ruling.

The Chairman: On my own account, and on behalf of all our colleagues, I assure the representative of South Africa that we are grateful for the position taken by his delegation.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): It was not our objective to waste the Committee's time. When we are dealing with the issue of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, we have to abide by and reflect agreements reached last July. It would bode ill for the future if we were now to start to diverge from the agreed language, considering that we are starting a follow-up process.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, my delegation will not challenge your ruling, and will go along with it. However, we want our reservation, as explained earlier, to be put on the record.

The Chairman: There has been something of a delay, but, to be positive, let us say that it has been very interesting from the professional standpoint.

Let us now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali on behalf of the Economic Community of West African States at the 15th meeting, held on 26 October 2001.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1 and A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors: Austria, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The wish was expressed that this draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.51/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on delegations wishing to explain their positions after the action taken.

Mr. Volski (Georgia): We want to join in the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Secretary of the Committee will take note of your statement.

The Committee will now move on to the next cluster contained in informal working paper No. 2/Rev.1 — namely, cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security". Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.27 is entitled "Regional disarmament". I call on delegations wishing to explain their position on this draft resolution before we take action.

I do not see any requests for the floor. Therefore, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.27. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.27, entitled "Regional disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 26 October 2001. The sponsors are listed in document L.27.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.27 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.27 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed with cluster 5. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.28 is entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their position before action is taken on this draft resolution.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.28. In 1993, the Disarmament Commission adopted consensus guidelines on the regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security. Therefore, we are not convinced that this draft resolution, in particular operative paragraph 2 — which calls on the Conference on Disarmament, a forum for negotiation of disarmament instruments of global application, to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control — has any productive value.

A reference has been made in the sixth preambular paragraph to conventional arms control in South Asia. India has security concerns that cannot be confined to what is referred to as "South Asia". The narrow definition of the draft resolution does not fully reflect the security concerns in South Asia and adopts an approach that is far too restrictive.

These reasons have also been spelled out in the past and, accordingly, my delegation will be casting a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Chairman: Are there any other delegations wishing to take the floor before action is taken? If I see no requests for the floor, we will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.28.

A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.28, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 26 October 2001. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.28 and A/C.1/56/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia,

Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
India

Abstaining:
Bhutan

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.28 was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: Are there any delegations who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted?

I see none. Therefore, let us proceed to take up cluster 6, "Confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments". Working paper No. 2/Rev.1 lists two draft resolutions, the first of which is A/C.1/56/L.30, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". Before proceeding to the vote, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution.

There being none, I will therefore ask the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.30. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.30, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October 2001. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.30 and A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors: Malta, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.30 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.30 was adopted.

The Chairman: Let us proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.42, "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures". Again, I ask if any delegations wish to take the floor to explain their position or their vote before action is taken on this draft resolution.

I see no request for the floor, so we will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.42.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.42, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.42 and A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Cyprus, Grenada, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, San Marino, Thailand, Tonga and Uruguay.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.42 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.42 was adopted.

The Chairman: Let us proceed further to cluster 7, on disarmament machinery. We have here a number of draft resolutions, the first one being A/C.1/56/L.4, "Report of the Disarmament Commission". Do any delegations wish to take the floor to explain their positions or their vote before action is taken?

I see no request for the floor. Therefore, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.4.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.4, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Jamaica at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/56/L.4.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have also expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to proceed and to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.4 was adopted.

The Chairman: The next draft resolution that we will tackle is A/C.1/56/L.19, "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". Do any delegations wish to explain their vote or their position before we take action on A/C.1/56/L.19?

That does not seem to be the case. Therefore, let us proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.19.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.19, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/56/L.19.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.19 was adopted.

The Chairman: Let us proceed further. We have before us draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.36, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before we take action?

That does not seem to be the case. Therefore, let us proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.36.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.36, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Ecuador at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October. I would also like to announce that Ecuador has also became a sponsor of that draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.36 was adopted.

The Chairman: The next draft resolution before us is A/C.1/56/L.46 under cluster 7, "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". Do any delegations wish to speak before action is taken on this draft resolution?

If that is not the case, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.46.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.46, entitled "United Nations

Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Haiti on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 29 October.

I would also like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to document A/C.1/56/L.53, which is a statement submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.46 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.46 was adopted.

The Chairman: Let us now proceed to cluster 8, on other disarmament measures. We have here four draft resolutions, the first being A/C.1/56/L.13, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". Again, does any delegation wish to explain its vote or its position before action is taken?

That does not seem to be the case. Let us proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.13, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.13 and A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Namibia, Pakistan, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Tonga, Ukraine, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.13 was adopted by 86 votes to 42, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.20, cluster 8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.20, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement Non-Aligned Countries at the 17th meeting, on 30 October.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.20 was adopted.

The Chairman: I give the floor to those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): I requested the floor so that the record of today's proceedings will reflect the fact that the United States did not participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.20, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We continue to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on this matter.

Accordingly, the United States does not, and will not, consider itself bound by the Declaration in the Final Document of the International Conference.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland and Liechtenstein — align themselves with this statement.

As was the case last year, the member States of the European Union joined in the consensus that emerged on the resolution dealing with the relationship between disarmament and development, and they wish to explain the significance of this position.

While we recognize the considerable benefits that can accrue from disarmament, nevertheless it must be noted that there is no simple and automatic link between the commitments of the European Union with respect to cooperation for economic and social development on the one hand, and the savings that could be realized by all in other fields, including disarmament, on the other.

Nevertheless, I wish to stress the extent of the European Union's commitment to cooperation for development, and we would like to recall that it is by far the largest contributor in terms of official development assistance.

The Chairman: We now turn to the next draft resolution under cluster 8, A/C.1/56/L.21, "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.21.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.21, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 17th meeting, on 30 October.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.21 was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): The United States remains uncertain about the purpose and objectives of this resolution. We are not convinced of its relevance to the work of the First Committee. Simply put, the United States sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements.

Agreements of this kind are uniquely intricate and difficult enough to negotiate without having to consider how to focus on, or draw up, vague environmental norms. Of course, no one could oppose the idea of preserving the environment. States parties to bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account in carrying out such agreements.

The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

While draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.21 avoids the overtly objectionable language used several years ago, we continue to question its relevance, purpose and utility. The United States has therefore abstained.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.22, under cluster 8, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

If no delegations wish to take the floor before the voting to explain their position or vote, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.22.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): We request a recorded vote on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting. We are now taking action on A/C.1/56/L.22.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of Non-Aligned Movement at the 17th meeting, on 30 October.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.22 was adopted by 105 votes to 3, with 37 abstentions.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted, we will proceed.

We have the next cluster before us, with one draft resolution in it, cluster 9, entitled "Related matters of disarmament and international security". Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.39 is entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position before action is taken, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.39. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.39, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 17th meeting, on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/56/L.39 and A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Azerbaijan and El Salvador.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.39 was adopted.

The Chairman: Let us proceed to cluster 10, entitled "International security". We have here draft decision A/C.1/56/L.23, "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

If no delegations wish to make explanations of vote or position before action is taken on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.23, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.23.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.23, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 17th meeting, on 30 October.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft decision have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.23 was adopted.

The Chairman: The next draft resolution under cluster 10 is A/C.1/56/L.37, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take action on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.37, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 16th meeting, on 29 October 2001. The sponsors are listed the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/56/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors: Albania, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.37 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action under cluster 10, "International security", on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.41/Rev.1. The draft resolution is entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe". If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.41/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.41/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security — good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 15th meeting, on 26 October 2001. The sponsors are listed in it. In addition, Greece has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

I would like to draw attention to the following drafting amendment to operative paragraph 15: in the second line, between "South-Eastern Europe" and "welcomes", add "and".

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Cuba for an explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation intended not to participate if there had been a vote. But we heeded the wish of the sponsors that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. Naturally, we did not intend to block that wish. We simply want to have the record reflect the fact that, while our delegation did not oppose the wish of the majority that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus, we have reservations about some concepts and elements that it contains. Therefore, we did not join the consensus on the draft resolution, although we did not oppose its adoption without a vote.

Organization of work

The Chairman: We have exhausted the content of informal working paper No. 2/Rev.1.

We are supposed to have a meeting this afternoon to continue taking drafts. I have before me six draft resolutions that were supposed to come up tomorrow, and I wonder whether their sponsors are ready for action on them this afternoon. They are draft resolutions A/C.1/56/L.6, A/C.1/56/L.24, A/C.1/56/L.11, A/C.1/56/L.40, A/C.1/56/L.50 and A/C.1/56/L.3/Rev.1. If the delegations concerned are ready for action in the course of this afternoon, we could expedite our work and not leave the six draft resolutions that I have enumerated for tomorrow morning. I am asking the delegations concerned to let us know the state of affairs, because that would facilitate the planning of our Committee's work.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation wishes that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.50, entitled "United

Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", be considered this afternoon.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): We are ready for action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.40 this afternoon.

Mr. Antonov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to confirm what we have already told the Secretariat about our readiness to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/L.3/Rev.1.

Mr. Mourão (Brazil): We are ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.24 this afternoon.

Mr. Baeidi Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have heard the sponsors of the other draft resolutions express their readiness for action on them this afternoon, and my delegation sees no problem with regard to acting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.6. But we have been approached by some other delegations which have said that, since they are working on their statements, they would prefer that it be acted upon tomorrow. I leave this question to you, Mr. Chairman. If it is possible for the Committee, we see no problem in delaying action on this draft until tomorrow. But equally, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.6, we see no problem in acting on it this afternoon.

The Chairman: Before I comment on that, I wonder whether other delegations wish to share their insights. We have so far been speaking about five draft resolutions. Nobody has reacted with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.11, but I understand that it might be ready for tomorrow.

We could perhaps take up draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.6 towards the end of this afternoon's meeting, which would give time for delegations to work on statements. If it is ready, we shall proceed. If not, we will have to take it up tomorrow. Let us make a desperate try. If we could have it on board in the course of this afternoon, that would be better. Therefore, we shall meet this afternoon and consider the draft resolutions that various representatives have mentioned.

Since we will have only one, or possibly two, draft resolutions to tackle in the course of tomorrow, we could eliminate the meeting planned for Thursday afternoon and take the remaining draft resolutions, or one remaining draft resolution, on Friday, 2 November, in the afternoon. I do not think that for one or possibly two draft resolutions we will have to assemble again on Thursday afternoon.

I intend to adjourn this afternoon's meeting earlier than usual so that the ceremony of the presentation of the 2001 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship certificates can take place between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m.

I would also like to inform members about a change in the timetable. As I have said, Thursday afternoon's meeting will be cancelled, and we will have a meeting on Friday afternoon, 2 November, bringing on board the one or two remaining draft resolutions which seem to be ready for action. Then next week there will be two meetings — morning and afternoon — on Monday, 5 November, instead of the one that we had originally planned for the morning. There will be only one meeting on Wednesday, 7 November, in the afternoon, when we had planned two meetings, in the morning and the afternoon. There will be only one meeting on 7 November, in the afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.